arXiv:math/0111194v1 [math.AG] 18 Nov 2001

p-ADIC VARIATION OF L FUNCTIONS OF EXPONENTIAL SUMS, I

HUI JUNE ZHU

Abstract. For a polynomial $f(x)$ in $(\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})[x]$ of degree $d \geq 3$ let $L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T)$ be the L function of the exponential sum of f mod p. Let $\mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$ denote the Newton polygon of $L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T)$. Let $\mathrm{HP}(f)$ denote the Hodge polygon of f, which is the lower convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of the points $(n, \frac{n(n+1)}{2d})$ for $0 \leq n \leq d-1$. We prove that there is a Zariski dense subset $\mathcal{U}$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in the space $\mathbb{A}^d$ of degree-d monic polynomials over $\mathbb{Q}$ such that $\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathrm{HP}(f)$ for all $f \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q})$. Moreover, we determine the p-adic valuation of every coefficient of $L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T)$ for p large enough and f in $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q})$.

1. Introduction

In this paper d is an integer ≥ 3. Let $\mathbb{A}^d$ be the affine space of dimension d, identified with the space of degree-d monic polynomials parametered by their coefficients. We always assume that p is any prime coprime to d. Let $f(x)$ a polynomial of one variable in $\mathbb{A}^d(\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})$. Let $E(x) = \exp(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{p^j}}{p^j})$ be the Artin-Hasse exponential. Let γ be a root of $\log(E(x))$ in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$ with $\mathrm{ord}_p\gamma = \frac{1}{p-1}$. Then $E(\gamma)$ is a primitive p-th root of unity. Denote it by ζ_p. It is observed that $\mathbb{Z}_p[\gamma] = \mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p]$. For every $\ell \geq 1$, recall the exponential sums of the reduction $f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ of f modulo p

$$S_\ell(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}} \zeta_p^{\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}/\mathbb{F}_p}(f(x)\otimes \mathbb{F}_p)}.$$

Then L-function of the exponential sum of $f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ is defined by

$$L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) := \exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} S_\ell(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \frac{T^\ell}{\ell}). \tag{1}$$

It is a theorem of Dwork-Bombieri-Grothendieck that

$$L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) \quad = \quad 1 + b_1 T + b_2 T^2 + \ldots + b_{d-1} T^{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p][T]. \tag{2}$$

Let $\mathrm{ord}_p(\cdot)$ denote the unique extension of the (additive) p-adic valuation in $\mathbb{Q}_p$ to $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p$. In this paper we also denote by $\mathrm{ord}_p(\cdot)$ the p-adic valuation of the *content of a power series over* $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_p$ (see [10] for its standard definition). Define the *Newton polygon* of the L-function of $f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ as the lower convex hull of the points $(n, \mathrm{ord}_p b_n)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ for $0 \leq n \leq d-1$, where we set $b_0 = 1$. We denote it by $\mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$. The *Hodge polygon* of f is the lower convex hull in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of the points $(n, \frac{n(n+1)}{2d})$ for

---

Date: Nov 18, 2001.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11,14.

Key words and phrases. Newton polygons; Hodge polygons; L functions; Zeta functions; exponential sums; Artin-Schreier curves; p-adic variation; A conjecture of Wan.

$0 \leq n \leq d-1$. It is known that $\mathrm{HP}(f)$ is a lower bound of $\mathrm{NP}(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)$ and that if $p\equiv 1 \bmod d$ then $\mathrm{NP}(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)=\mathrm{HP}(f)$ for every $f\in\mathbb{A}^d(\mathbb{Q})$ (see [1] and [3]).

The main result of this paper is Theorem 1.1. It was a conjecture of Daqing Wan, proposed in the following form in the number theory seminar at Berkeley in the fall of 2000 (see also [17, Section 2.5] for developments related to this topic).

Theorem 1.1. *There is a Zariski dense open subset $\mathcal{U}$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{A}^d$ such that for all $f(x)\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q})$ we have*

$$\lim_{p\to\infty}\mathrm{NP}(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)=\mathrm{HP}(f).$$

The cases $d=3$ and 4 are proved by [16] and [6] respectively. The first slope case is proved recently by an elementary method in [13] (see also [12]). Further results concerning more conjectures of Daqing Wan [18] will be in [20].

Theorem 1.1 yields a one-variable answer towards questions proposed in [7], there Katz asked how the Newton polygon of the L function varies with the prime p. See Katz's questions and Sperber's example on page 151 of [7, Chapter 5.1]. For more developments in these directions see [14], [15] and [2] and their bibliographies.

It is well-known that the $L(f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)$ is intimately connected to the study of the p-cover of the projective line. Let $X_f: y^p-y=f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p$ be an Artin-Schreier curve over $\mathbb{F}_p$. Recall that $\mathrm{NP}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)$ is the p-adic Newton polygon of the numerator of the Zeta function $\mathrm{Zeta}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)$ of X_f over $\mathbb{F}_p$. We have

$$\mathrm{Zeta}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)=\frac{\mathrm{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)/\mathbb{Q}}(L(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T))}{(1-T)(1-pT)} \tag{3}$$

where the norm $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)/\mathbb{Q}}$ being interpreted as the product of the conjugates of $L(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)$ over $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)$, the automorphism acting trivially on the variable T. Since we do not find suitable reference for this well-known fact, we sketch its proof below. For convenience let $X_f^\dagger$ be the curve X_f minus the point at infinity. Here $\mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)$ abbreviates the trace map from $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$ to $\mathbb{F}_p$. It is easy to verify that

$$\#X_f^\dagger(\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell})=\sum_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}}\zeta_p^{a\mathrm{Tr}(f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Zeta}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T) &= \exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}(1+\#X_f^{\dagger}(\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}))\frac{T^\ell}{\ell}) = \frac{1}{(1-T)}\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\#X_f^{\dagger}(\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell})\frac{T^\ell}{\ell})\\
&= \frac{1}{(1-T)}\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}(\sum_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}}\zeta_p^{a\mathrm{Tr}(f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)})\frac{T^\ell}{\ell})\\
&= \frac{1}{(1-T)}\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}(p^\ell+\sum_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p^*}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}}\zeta_p^{a\mathrm{Tr}(f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)})\frac{T^\ell}{\ell})\\
&= \frac{1}{(1-T)(1-pT)}\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}(\sum_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p^*}\sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}}\zeta_p^{a\mathrm{Tr}(f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)})\frac{T^\ell}{\ell})\\
&= \frac{1}{(1-T)(1-pT)}\prod_{a\in\mathbb{F}_p^*}\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}}\zeta_p^{a\mathrm{Tr}(f(x)\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)})\frac{T^\ell}{\ell})\\
&= \frac{1}{(1-T)(1-pT)}\mathrm{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)/\mathbb{Q}}(\exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}S_\ell(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)\frac{T^\ell}{\ell})),
\end{aligned}$$

and this proves our claim. Recall that the Newton polygon $\mathrm{NP}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)$ is the p-adic Newton polygon of the denominator of $\mathrm{Zeta}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)$. By (3) it is easily seen that $\mathrm{NP}(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)$ is precisely equal to $\mathrm{NP}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)$ shrunk by a factor of $\frac{1}{p-1}$ horizontally and vertically, which is denoted by $\frac{\mathrm{NP}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)}{p-1}$. Thus the following corollary follows from Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.2. *There exists a Zariski dense open subset $\mathcal{U}$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{A}^d$ such that for every $f\in\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q})$ we have*

$$\lim_{p\to\infty}\frac{\mathrm{NP}(X_f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)}{p-1}=\mathrm{HP}(f).$$

Remark 1.3. For every $d\geq 3$ the limit $\lim_{p\to\infty}\mathrm{NP}(x^d\otimes\mathbb{F}_p)$ does not exist. See Proposition 6.1 for details.

This paper is organized as follows. We use Dwork p-adic theory in section 2 to derive a formula of the desired L function of exponential sums of $f(x)$ over $\mathbb{F}_p$ in terms of some Fredholm determinants denoted by $C_n(\cdot)$. Section 3 is a key step in the proof, it defines some Zariski dense subset defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$, which only depends on the residue class of p and not the size of p. It is recommended that the reader continues with section 4, where we immediately use Dwork's p-adic theory to compute p-adic valuations of the Fredholm matrix of the Frobenius map and Fredholm determinant for $\vec{a}\in\mathcal{W}(\mathbb{Q})$ and for p large enough. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is located in section 5. Finally we conclude the paper with a few remarks of open questions and examples in section 6.

Acknowledgments. It is my great pleasure to thank Alan Adolphson and Steven Sperber who exposed me to Dwork theory during the Dwork trimester in Italy. I thank Hanfeng Li for careful reading and comments to an earlier version. Most of all I thank Bjorn Poonen for generously sharing ideas and offering support to this work.

2. Dwork p-adic theory

The fundamental material in our exposition follows [3, Sections II and III] (see also [4] [5] and [1]). Recall that p is any prime number coprime to d. Let $\overline{f}(x) = x^d + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \overline{a}_i x^i$ be a polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_p$. (See section 5 to find out why we confine ourselves to a polynomial with no constant term.

Write $\vec{\hat{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \ldots, \hat{a}_{d-1})$ where $\hat{a}_i$ is the Teichmüller lifting of $\overline{a}_i$, that is, $\hat{a}_i \equiv a_i \bmod p$ and $\hat{a}_i^p = \hat{a}_i$. Let $f(x) = x^d + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x^i \in (\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})[x]$ and $a_d = 1$ such that reduction $f(x) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ of $f(x)$ at p is equal to $\overline{f}(x)$. Let $\theta(x) = E(\gamma x)$, where $E(\cdot)$ and γ as defined in section 1. Then we may write $\theta(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \lambda_m x^m$ for $\lambda_m \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p]$. Note the following properties,

$$\mathrm{ord}_p \lambda_m \quad \geq \quad \frac{m}{p-1}; \tag{4}$$

for $0 \leq m \leq p-1$ we have,

$$\lambda_m = \frac{\gamma^m}{m!} \text{ and } \mathrm{ord}_p \lambda_m = \frac{m}{p-1}. \tag{5}$$

Let $\vec{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_{d-1})$ be a vector of variables and $\vec{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_{d-1})$. Write $\vec{A}^{\vec{m}}$ for the monomial $A_1^{m_1} \cdots A_{d-1}^{m_{d-1}}$. Let $G_n(\vec{A}) = 0$ for $n < 0$. For every integer $n \geq 0$ let

$$G_n(\vec{A}) := \sum_{\substack{m_\ell \geq 0 \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \ell m_\ell = n}} \lambda_{m_1} \cdots \lambda_{m_d} \vec{A}^{\vec{m}}. \tag{6}$$

Clearly we observe that $G_n(\vec{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p][\vec{A}]$, that is, $G_n(\vec{A})$ is a polynomial in variable $\vec{A}$ and with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p]$. For all integers $m_1, \ldots, m_d \geq 0$ such that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \ell m_\ell = n$, we have $d(m_1 + \cdots + m_d) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \ell m_\ell = n$ and so $\min(m_1 + \cdots + m_d) = \lceil \frac{n}{d} \rceil$. Therefore by (6) we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_p G_n(\vec{A}) \geq \frac{\min(m_1 + \cdots + m_d)}{p-1} \geq \frac{\lceil \frac{n}{d} \rceil}{p-1} \geq \frac{n}{d(p-1)}. \tag{7}$$

Let $G(X) := \prod_{i=1}^{d} \theta(\hat{a}_i X^i) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p][[X]]$. We have

$$G(X) = (\sum_{m_1=0}^{\infty} \lambda_{m_1} \hat{a}_1^{m_1} X^{m_1}) \cdots (\sum_{m_d=0}^{\infty} \lambda_{m_d} \hat{a}_d^{m_d} X^{d m_d}) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n(\vec{\hat{a}}) X^n.$$

Let $C_0(\vec{A}) = 1$, and for every $n \geq 1$ let

$$C_n(\vec{A}) := \sum_{\substack{1 \leq u_1 < u_2 < \ldots < u_n \\ \sigma \in S_n}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} G_{p u_i - u_{\sigma(i)}}(\vec{A}), \tag{8}$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)$ is the signature of the permutation σ in the n-th symmetric group S_n. It can be verified that this definition makes sense and that $C_n(\vec{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p][[\vec{A}]]$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let p be a prime coprime to d. For $f(x) = x^d + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} a_i x^i \in (\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})[x]$, write $\vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1})$. Let $\vec{\hat{a}} = (\hat{a}_1, \ldots, \hat{a}_{d-1})$ be Teichmüller lifting of*

$\vec{\bar{a}} = (\bar{a}_1, \ldots, \bar{a}_{d-1})$. *Then*

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) &= 1 + b_1(\vec{a})T + \cdots + b_{d-1}(\vec{a})T^{d-1} \\
&= \frac{1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n C_n(\vec{\bar{a}}) T^n}{(1 - pT)(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n C_n(\vec{\bar{a}}) p^n T^n)},
\end{aligned}
\tag{9}
$$

where $b_1(\vec{a}), \ldots, b_{d-1}(\vec{a}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p]$.

Proof. The first equality is a rephrase of (2). For every positive integer ℓ let

$$S_\ell^*(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) := \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}^*} \zeta_p^{\mathrm{Tr}_{\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}/\mathbb{F}_p}(f(x) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)}.$$

Let

$$L^*(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) := \exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} S_\ell^*(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \frac{T^\ell}{\ell}).$$

Note that $S_\ell^*(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = S_\ell(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) - 1$ so

$$
\begin{aligned}
L^*(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) &= \exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (S_\ell(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) - 1)) \\
&= (1 - T) \exp(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} S_\ell(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \frac{T^\ell}{\ell}) \\
&= (1 - T) L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T). \qquad (10)
\end{aligned}
$$

For any $c > 0$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ let $\mathcal{L}(c, b)$ be the set of power series defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(c, b) := \{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n X^n \mid A_n \in \mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p), \mathrm{ord}_p A_n \geq \frac{cn}{d} + b\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}(c) := \bigcup_{b \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(c, b)$. From (7) we have $G(X) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} G_n(\vec{\bar{a}}) X^n$ lies in $\mathcal{L}(1/(p-1))$. For any $\sum B_n X^n$ in $\mathcal{L}(c)$, let ψ be the Hecke operator from $\mathcal{L}(c)$ to $\mathcal{L}(cp)$ given by $\psi(\sum B_n X^n) = \sum B_{pn} X^n$. Let $\alpha_1 := \psi \cdot G(X)$ be the endomorphism $\mathcal{L}(p/(p-1))$ defined by the composition of the multiplication map by $G(X)$ then ψ, namely,

$$\alpha_1 \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} B_i X^i \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} G_{pi-j}(\vec{\bar{a}}) B_j \right) X^i.$$

Choose the standard monomial basis $\{1, x, x^2, \ldots\}$ for the p-adic Banach space $\mathcal{L}(p/(p-1))$. Then the $\mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$-endomorphism α_1 of $\mathcal{L}(p/(p-1))$ has a matrix representation by $\{G_{pi-j}(\vec{\bar{a}})\}_{i,j \geq 0}$. We identify α_1 with this matrix from now on. By the Dwork trace formula (see [3, Section III]) we have

$$L^*(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) = \frac{\det(1 - \alpha_1 \cdot T)}{\det(1 - \alpha_1 \cdot pT)}.$$

For the first row (i.e., $i = 0$) of α_1, we have $G_{pi-j}(\vec{\bar{a}}) = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$ and $G_0(\vec{\bar{a}}) = 1$. By (8) we have

$$\det(1 - \alpha_1 \cdot T) = (1 - T) \det(1 - \{G_{pi-j}(\vec{\bar{a}}) T\}_{i,j \geq 1}) = (1 - T) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n C_n(\vec{\bar{a}}) T^n.$$

Therefore, by (10) we have

$$(1-T)L(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)=L^*(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T)=\frac{(1-T)\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^nC_n(\vec{\hat{a}})T^n}{(1-pT)\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^nC_n(\vec{\hat{a}})p^nT^n}.$$

By simplification of the above formula, our assertion follows. □

3. Zariski dense subsets

This section is self-contained. We will construct a suitable Zariski dense open subset $\mathcal{W}$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ with suitable property we shall utilize in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in section 5. The introduction of many curiously defined invariants here will be self-explained in section 4.

Fix an integer r with $1\leq r\leq d-1$ and $\gcd(d,r)=1$. Let $1\leq n\leq d-1$. For any $\vec{m}=(m_1,\ldots,m_{d-1})\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$ let $|\vec{m}|=\sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1}m_\ell$ and $\vec{m}!=m_1!\cdots m_{d-1}!$. Recall that d is an integer ≥ 3. Let $1\leq i,j\leq d-1$. Let

$$r_{ij} \quad := \quad d\left\lceil\frac{ri-j}{d}\right\rceil-(ri-j).$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{r}_n:=\{r_{ij}\}_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$. Then $0\leq r_{ij}\leq d-1$ and there are no two identical entries in any row (column). In $\mathbf{r}_{d-1}$ for every $1\leq i\leq d-1$ there is a unique j with $r_{ij}=0$.*

Proof. By definition, r_{ij} is the least non-negative residue of $-(ri-j)\bmod d$ so we have $0\leq r_{ij}\leq d-1$. We prove for rows. The argument for columns is almost identical. Suppose we have $r_{ij}=r_{ij'}$ then $ri-j\equiv ri-j'\bmod d$ by definition. Then $j\equiv j'\bmod d$. Since $1\leq j,j'\leq n\leq d-1$ we have $j=j'$. So there are no identical entries in any row of $\mathbf{r}_n$. Note that r is coprime to d so for every $1\leq i\leq d-1$ there is a unique $1\leq j\leq d-1$ such that $ri\equiv j\bmod d$. This is equivalent to $r_{ij}=0$ by definition. This proves the last assertion. □

By Lemma 3.1 for every $1\leq i\leq d-1$ we have a unique $1\leq j\leq d-1$ such that $r_{ij}=0$. We denote this j by J_i. Let

$$\delta_{ij}=\begin{cases}0 & \text{for } j\leq J_i\\ 1 & \text{for } j>J_i.\end{cases}$$

We want to point out the following elementary property and leave the proof to the reader as an exercise.

Lemma 3.2. *For $1\leq i,j\leq d-1$ we have*

$$\left\lceil\frac{pi-j}{d}\right\rceil=\frac{pi+r_{ij}-j}{d}\equiv\frac{r_{ij}-j}{d}\bmod p \tag{11}$$

$$\left\lceil\frac{pi-j}{d}\right\rceil=\left\lceil\frac{pi-1}{d}\right\rceil-\delta_{ij}. \tag{12}$$

For any $0\leq s\leq n$ define a subset in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$ by

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij}^s \quad := \quad \{\vec{m}=(m_1,m_2,\ldots,m_{d-1})\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}\mid\sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1}\ell m_{d-\ell}=r_{ij}+ds\}.$$

Note the important yet easy fact that $\mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$ is non-empty for any $0 \leq s \leq n$. Recall $\vec{A}^{\vec{m}} = A_1^{m_1} \cdots A_{d-1}^{m_{d-1}}$. For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ define an auxiliary polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} &H_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) \\ &:= \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} \frac{(\frac{r_{i1}-1}{d}+n)(\frac{r_{i1}-1}{d}+n-1)\cdots(\frac{r_{i1}-1}{d}-\delta_{ij}+s+1-|\vec{m}|)}{\vec{m}!}\vec{A}^{\vec{m}}. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This non-zero polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[\vec{A}]$ plays a central role in the technique of this paper.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $0 \leq s \leq n$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.*

1). The polynomial $H_{ij}^s(\vec{A})$ in $\mathbb{Q}[\vec{A}]$ is supported on every $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$. The degree of its monomials ranges from $s + \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+s}{d-1} \right\rceil$ up to $r_{ij} + ds$, where the maximal degree is attained at exactly one monomial $A_{d-1}^{r_{ij}+ds}$ while the minimal degree is attained at one or more monomials.

2). The polynomial $H_{ij}^s(\vec{A})$ has a constant term if and only if $s = r_{ij} = 0$; it has a linear term if and only if $s = 0$ and $r_{ij} \neq 0$, in which case this linear monomial is exactly $A_{d-r_{ij}}$.

Proof. 1). Since $\gcd(r, d) = 1$ we have $-(ir-1) \not\equiv 1 \bmod d$. Hence $\frac{r_{i1}-1}{d} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ and $h_{\vec{m},i,j}^s \neq 0$. Therefore, in the polynomial $H_{ij}^s(\vec{A})$, This proves the first assertion. By the first assertion, it remains to prove

$$\min_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} |\vec{m}| = s + \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+s}{d-1} \right\rceil \tag{14}$$

$$\max_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} |\vec{m}| = r_{ij} + ds. \tag{15}$$

For $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$ we have $|\vec{m}| \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} \ell m_{d-\ell} = r_{ij} + ds$ and the equality holds if and only if $m_1 = \cdots = m_{d-2} = 0$ and $m_{d-1} = r_{ij} + ds$. This verifies (15). On the other hand, for $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$ clearly $(d-1)|\vec{m}| \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} \ell m_{d-\ell} = r_{ij} + ds$. So

$$|\vec{m}| \geq \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+ds}{d-1} \right\rceil = s + \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+s}{d-1} \right\rceil.$$

It is easy to see there are $m_1, \ldots, m_{d-1} \geq 0$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} m_\ell = \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+ds}{d-1} \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} (d-\ell) m_\ell = r_{ij} + ds. \tag{16}$$

For example, let κ be the least non-negative residue of $-(r_{ij} + ds) \bmod (d-1)$ then let $m_1 = \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+ds}{d-1} \right\rceil - \kappa$, $m_2 = \kappa$ and let the rest $m_\ell = 0$. This says that there are $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$ with $|\vec{m}| = \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+ds}{d-1} \right\rceil$. This proves (14).

2). From 1) suppose $H_{ij}^s(\vec{A})$ has a linear term then $s + \left\lceil \frac{r_{ij}+s}{d-1} \right\rceil = 1$, which implies $s = 0$ and $r_{ij} \neq 0$. In this case the only solution to (16) is $m_{d-r_{ij}} = 1$ and $m_\ell = 0$ for all $\ell \neq r_{ij}$. So the linear monomial is $A_{d-r_{ij}}$. In the same vein we obtain the assertion about constant term. $\square$

Let

$$c_n \quad := \quad \frac{1}{d}\left(\max_{\sigma\in S_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} - \min_{\sigma\in S_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)}\right); \tag{17}$$

For any $0\leq t\leq c_n$, let

$$S_n^t \quad := \quad \{\sigma\in S_n | \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} = \min_{\sigma\in S_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} + dt\}. \tag{18}$$

It is easy to note that $S_n = \bigcup_{t=0}^{c_n} S_n^t$. For any $0\leq t\leq c_n$, let

$$f_n^t(\vec{A}) \quad := \quad \sum_{\substack{s_0+s_1+\cdots+s_n=t\\ s_\ell\geq 0}} \sum_{\sigma\in S_n^{s_0}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{A}). \tag{19}$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $1\leq n\leq d-1$. Then the polynomial $f_n^t(\vec{A})\neq 0$ for some $0\leq t\leq c_n$.*

Proof. First step, we show that in the formal expansion of $\sum_{t=0}^{c_n} f_n^t$ every lowest-degree-monomial is in the formal expansion of $\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0$ for some $\sigma\in S_n$. In other words the lowest-degree-monomials are in the summand where $s_1=\cdots=s_n=0$ and $s_0=t$. Suppose $s_1>0$ say, by Lemma 3.3 we have for every $\sigma\in S_n$ the degree of a lowest-degree-monomial in $\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0$ is $\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\lceil\frac{r_{i,\sigma(i)}}{d-1}\right\rceil$ which is strictly less than $\sum_{i=1}^{n}(s_i+\left\lceil\frac{r_{i,\sigma(i)}+s_i}{d-1}\right\rceil)$, the degree of a lowest-degree-monomial in $\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}$.

By the first step, the lowest-degree-monomials lie in the following sub-sum of $\sum_{t=0}^{c_n} f_n^t$:

$$\sum_{t=0}^{c_n}\sum_{\sigma\in S_n^t}\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0(\vec{A}) = \sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0(\vec{A})$$

since $S_n=\bigcup_{t=0}^{c_n} S_n^t$.

Now we proceed to our second step. For every i let $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{\dagger}$ be the lowest-degree-monomial of $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0$. (For example, if $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0 = -3A_1^5A_2+\frac{2}{3}A_3$ then $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{\dagger}=A_3$ and if $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^0=-3A_1^5A_4+\frac{2}{3}$ then $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{\dagger}=1$.) Let

$$D_n(\vec{A}) \quad := \quad \sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^{n} H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{\dagger}(\vec{A})\in\mathbb{Q}[\vec{A}]. \tag{20}$$

Recall from Lemma 3.3 that $H_{i,\sigma(i)}^{\dagger}=1$ or $A_{d-r_{i,\sigma(i)}}$ depending on $r_{i,\sigma(i)}=0$ or not, respectively. By adding in an auxiliary variable A_d we let $\tilde{D}_n$ be the determinant of a matrix $\{A_{d-r_{ij}}\}_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{D}_n(A_1,\ldots,A_d) \quad &= \quad \sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^{n} A_{d-r_{i,\sigma(i)}}\\ &= \quad \sum_{\sigma\in S_n}\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)A_d^{\#\{1\leq i\leq n|r_{i,\sigma(i)}=0\}}\prod_{m=1}^{d-1}A_m^{\#\{1\leq i\leq n|r_{i,\sigma(i)}=d-m\}}.\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

It is clear that $\tilde{D}_n$ is homogeneous of degree n in $\mathbb{Q}[A_1,\ldots,A_d]$. We claim there is a unique highest-lexicographic-order-monomial in the formal expansion of $\tilde{D}_n$. Let $\mathcal{S}_{-1} = S_n$. For every $0 \le k \le d-1$ let $\mathcal{S}_k$ be the set of all $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_{k-1}$ such that $\sigma(i) = j$ if $r_{ij} = k$ and if every entry in the i-th row and the j-th column is $\ge k$. Perusing the definition we note that $\mathcal{S}_k$ is not empty by Lemma 3.1. By Lemma 3.1 again, we note that $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ contains exactly one element. It is easy to see that the set of permutations in $\mathcal{S}_0$ gives monomials whose A_d-exponents are highest in (21). Inductively, we note that the unique permutation in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1}$ gives the highest-lexicographic-order-monomial, denoted by $M(A_1,\ldots,A_d)$, in $\tilde{D}_n$. Since $D_n(\vec{A}) = \tilde{D}_n(A_1,\ldots,A_{d-1},1)$, the monomial $M(A_1,\ldots,A_{d-1},1)$ is a lowest-degree-monomial in D_n and of the highest-lexicographic-order among these lowest-degree-monomials. Its uniqueness assures that it can not be cancelled out among the lowest-degree-monomials. Let σ_n be the unique element in $\mathcal{S}_{d-1} \subset S_n$. Since $S_n = \bigcup_{t=0}^{c_n} S_n^t$, there is an $0 \le t \le c_n$ such that $\sigma_n \in S_n^t$. Then f_n^t is not a zero polynomial. ☐

Let t_n be the least t with $0 \le t \le c_n$ such that $f_n^t(\vec{A}) \ne 0$. (By Lemma 3.4 this t_n exists.)

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{V}_n$ be the complement in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ of the hypersurface defined by $f_n^{t_n}(\vec{A}) = 0$. Let $\mathcal{W}_r := \bigcap_{n=1}^{d-1} \mathcal{V}_n$. Then $\mathcal{W}_r$ is a Zariski dense open subset defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$.*

Proof. Lemma 3.4 asserts that none of these hypersurfaces is equal to $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$. Hence $\mathcal{V}_n$ is non-empty and Zariski open in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$, but $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ is irreducible, so $\mathcal{V}_n$ is Zariski dense open in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ for every n. As a finite intersection, $\mathcal{W}_r$ is hence also Zariski dense open in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$. ☐

4. FREDHOLM DETERMINANTS AND THE L FUNCTION

In this section, we consider the p-adic valuation of $G_{pi-j}(\vec{A})$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p][\vec{A}]$ and that of the Fredholm determinant $C_n(\vec{A})$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\zeta_p][[\vec{A}]]$. We will consider $G_{pi-j}(\vec{A})$ and $C_n(\vec{A})$ as formal expressions in $\mathbb{Z}_p[\vec{A}][\gamma]$ and $\mathbb{Z}_p[\vec{A}][[\gamma]]$, respectively.

Let notations be as in sections 2 and 3. Recall r is an integer with $1 \le r \le d-1$ and $\gcd(r,d) = 1$. Let n be an integer with $1 \le n \le d-1$. Let p be a prime that $p \equiv r \bmod d$.

For any rational number R let $\gamma^{>R}$ denote the terms in $\mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)[[\vec{A}]]$ whose coefficients have p-adic valuation $> R/(p-1)$. We also use it to denote algebraic numbers in $\mathbb{Q}_p(\zeta_p)$ with p-adic valuation $> R/(p-1)$ and this shall not cause any confusion. Let

$$M_n := \min_{\sigma \in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi - \sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil .$$

The first lemma below derives properties from (17) and (18).

Lemma 4.1. *For any $s \geq 0$ we have*

$$c_n = \max_{\sigma\in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil - M_n \leq n; \tag{22}$$

$$M_n = \frac{n(n+1)(p-1)}{2d} + \frac{1}{d}\min_{\sigma\in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)}; \tag{23}$$

$$S_n^s = \{\sigma \in S_n | \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil = M_n + s\}. \tag{24}$$

Proof. Suppose $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in S_n$ are minimizer and maximizer of $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil$, respectively. Note that $\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil = \frac{pi-j+r_{ij}}{d}$ thus

$$\max_{\sigma\in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil - M_n = \frac{1}{d}\left(\max_{\sigma\in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} - \min_{\sigma\in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)}\right) = c_n.$$

For any i, since $1 \leq \sigma(i) \leq d-1$, we have

$$\left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma_2(i)}{d} \right\rceil \leq \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma_1(i)}{d} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Taking sum both sides and get

$$\max_{\sigma\in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil \leq M_n + n.$$

This proves (22). Since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d} \right\rceil = \frac{n(n+1)(p-1)}{2d} + \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)},$$

we see that (23) and (24) follows. □

For $0 \leq s \leq c_n$, and $i, j \geq 1$ let

$$K_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) := \sum_{\vec{m}\in\mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} \frac{\vec{A}^{\vec{m}}}{\vec{m}!(\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s - |\vec{m}|)!}. \tag{25}$$

Note that $K_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\vec{A}]$ for $p \geq d^2$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $G_n(\vec{A})$ be defined as in (6). For any $i, j \geq 1$ and $pi - j \geq 0$ we have*

$$\mathrm{ord}_p G_{pi-j}(\vec{A}) \geq \frac{\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil}{p-1}, \tag{26}$$

where $\mathrm{ord}_p(\cdot)$ *denote p-adic valuation of the content of $G_{pi-j}(\vec{A})$. If, in addition, $p \geq (d^2+1)(d-1)$ then*

$$G_{pi-j}(\vec{A}) = \sum_{s=0}^{c_n} \gamma^{\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s} K_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) + \gamma^{> \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + c_n}.$$

Proof. Clearly, (26) is a special case of (7). We shall prove the second equality. For $0 \le s \le c_n$, $m_\ell \ge 0$ and $m_1 + \cdots + m_d = \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s$, since $p \ge d^2 - 1$, we have $m_\ell \le \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + c_n \le p-1$. And by (5) and (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{pi-j}(\vec{A}) &= \sum_{\substack{m_1+\cdots+m_d \le \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + c_n \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^d \ell m_\ell = pi-j}} \lambda_{m_1} \cdots \lambda_{m_d} \vec{A}^{\vec{m}} + \gamma^{> \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + c_n} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{c_n} \sum \frac{\gamma^{m_1+\cdots+m_d} \vec{A}^{\vec{m}}}{m_1! \cdots m_d!} + \gamma^{> \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + c_n} \end{aligned}$$

where the last sum ranges over all $m_\ell \ge 0$ such that $m_1 + \cdots + m_d = \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s$ and $\sum_{\ell=1}^d \ell m_\ell = pi - j$. It is easy to see that this is a subset of $\mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$. Conversely, if $\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s$ then

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} m_\ell \le \sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} \ell m_{d-\ell} = r_{ij} + ds \le d - 1 + ds \le \left\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \right\rceil + s$$

since $p \ge (d^2+1)(d-1)$. Set $m_d = \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s - \sum_{\ell=1}^{d-1} m_\ell$, then $m_1 + \cdots + m_d = \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s$ and $\sum_{\ell=1}^d \ell m_\ell = pi - j$ where $m_\ell \ge 0$. Thus we have

$$G_{pi-j}(\vec{A}) = \sum_{s=0}^{c_n} \gamma^{\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s} \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} \frac{\vec{A}^{\vec{m}}}{\vec{m}!(\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s - |\vec{m}|)!} + \gamma^{> \lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + c_n}.$$

The lemma follows. ☐

Lemma 4.3. *Let $p \ge (d^2+1)(d-1)$ and let $C_n(\vec{A})$ be defined as in (8). We have*

$$\begin{aligned} C_n(\vec{A}) &= \det\{G_{pi-j}(\vec{A})\}_{1 \le i,j \le n} + \gamma^{> M_n + c_n} \\ &= \sum_{t=0}^{c_n} \gamma^{M_n+t} \sum_{\substack{s_0+\cdots+s_n=t \\ \sigma \in S_n^{s_0}}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{A}) + \gamma^{> M_n + c_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\vec{a} \in (\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})^{d-1}$. Suppose there exists $0 \le t'_n \le c_n$ such that

$$\sum_{\substack{s_0+\cdots+s_n=t \\ \sigma \in S_n^{s_0}}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{a}) \begin{cases} \equiv 0 \bmod p & \text{for all } 0 \le t < t'_n \\ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p & \text{for } t = t'_n. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\mathrm{ord}_p C_n(\vec{a}) = \frac{M_n + t'_n}{p-1}.$$

Proof. Recall $C_n(\vec{A})$ from (8). Suppose there is a t such that $u_t > n$, we claim that

$$\min_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathrm{ord}_p \prod_{t=1}^n G_{pu_t - u_{\sigma(t)}}(\vec{A}) > \frac{M_n + c_n}{p-1}. \tag{27}$$

Since $\sum_{t=1}^n u_t > \sum_{i=1}^n i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \left\lceil \frac{pu_t - u_{\sigma(t)}}{d}\right\rceil &\geq \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{t=1}^n \frac{pu_t - u_{\sigma(t)}}{d} \\
&= \frac{1}{d}\sum_{t=1}^n u_t \\
&\geq \frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^n i + \frac{1}{d} \\
&= \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{pi-\delta(i)}{d} + \frac{1}{d} \qquad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta \in S_n$. For $p \geq (d^2+1)(d-1) > d^2-d+1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \left\lceil \frac{pi-\delta(i)}{d}\right\rceil &\leq \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{pi-\delta(i)}{d} + \frac{n}{p-1} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{pi-\delta(i)}{d} + \frac{d-1}{p-1} \\
&< \frac{1}{p-1}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{pi-\delta(i)}{d} + \frac{1}{d} \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (28) and (29), we have

$$\min_{\sigma\in S_n} \mathrm{ord}_p \prod_{t=1}^n G_{pu_t - u_{\sigma(t)}}(\vec{A}) \quad > \quad \frac{1}{p-1}\max_{\delta\in S_n}\sum_{i=1}^n \left\lceil \frac{pi-\delta(i)}{d}\right\rceil = \frac{M_n + c_n}{p-1}$$

by (22). Perusal of (8) then shows the validity of our first equality. Now we have by Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2

$$\begin{aligned}
C_n(\vec{A}) &= \sum_{\sigma\in S_n} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^n G_{pi-\sigma(i)}(\vec{A}) + \gamma^{>M_n+c_n} \\
&= \sum_{\sigma\in S_n} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{s_i=0}^{c_n}\left(\gamma^{\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d}\rceil + s_i} K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{A}) + \gamma^{>\lceil \frac{pi-\sigma(i)}{d}\rceil + c_n}\right) + \gamma^{>M_n+c_n} \\
&= \sum_{s_0=0}^{c_n}\sum_{\sigma\in S_n^{s_0}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\sum_{\ell=0}^{c_n-s_0}\gamma^{M_n+s_0+\ell}\sum_{s_1+\cdots+s_n=\ell}\prod_{i=1}^n K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{A}) + \gamma^{>M_n+c_n} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^{c_n}\gamma^{M_n+t}\sum_{s_0+\cdots+s_n=t}\sum_{\sigma\in S_n^{s_0}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^n K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{A}) + \gamma^{>M_n+c_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of the second equality.

To show the last assertion, it is important to note that

$$\sum_{\substack{s_0+\cdots+s_n=t \\ \sigma\in S_n^{s_0}}} \mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^n K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\hat{a}) \tag{30}$$

lies in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. For $0 \leq t < t_n'$ since (30) vanishes mod$p$ its p-adic valuation is ≥ 1. So

$$\begin{aligned}
(31) \quad \mathrm{ord}_p\left(\gamma^{M_n+t}\sum_{\substack{s_0+\cdots+s_n=t\\ \sigma\in S_n^{s_0}}}\mathrm{sgn}(\sigma)\prod_{i=1}^{n}K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\hat{\vec{a}})\right) &\geq \frac{M_n+t+p-1}{p-1}\\
&> \frac{M_n+c_n}{p-1}\\
&\geq \frac{M_n+t_n'}{p-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $t = t_n'$ then (30) does not vanish mod$p$ so it is a p-adic unit, denoted by u. Combining with (31) we get

$$C_n(\vec{a}) = u\gamma^{M_n+t_n'} + \gamma^{>M_n+t_n'}.$$

Then our last assertion follows easily. □

5. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let notations be as in previous sections. For $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{Q})$ and for p large enough we give the exact p-adic valuation of $C_n(\vec{a})$ (in Lemma 5.2) and then $b_n(\vec{a})$ (in Corollary 5.3). These accumulate to the proof of Theorem 1.1 at the end of this section.

Before presenting our main result we start with a very elementary yet useful lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Fix an integer r with $1 \leq r \leq d-1$ and $\gcd(r,d)=1$. Let k be a rational number. Then $k \neq 0$ if and only if there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $p > N$ and $p \equiv r \bmod d$ we have $k \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$.*

Proof. Suppose $k = 0$. Then of course $k \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all p and of course for all $p \equiv r \bmod d$. This proves the first direction. Conversely, suppose $k \neq 0$. Then there are only finitely many primes p with $\mathrm{ord}_p k \neq 0$. So there exists $N > 0$ such that $k \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $p > N$ and this certainly includes all $p \equiv r \bmod d$. □

For any $1 \leq n \leq d-1$, we recall from section 3 that t_n is the least non-negative integer with $f_n^{t_n}(\vec{A}) \neq 0$. Recall that $\mathcal{V}_n$ is the complement in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ of the hypersurface defined by $f_n^{t_n}(\vec{A})$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $1 \leq n \leq d-1$. Let $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{V}_n$. If $p \equiv r \bmod d$ and p is large enough then we have*

$$(32) \quad \mathrm{ord}_p C_n(\hat{\vec{a}}) = \frac{M_n+t_n}{p-1} = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d} + \frac{\min_{\sigma\in S_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} + dt_n}{d(p-1)}.$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{p\to\infty}\mathrm{ord}_p C_n(\hat{\vec{a}}) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d}.$$

Proof. Through out this proof assume $p \equiv r \bmod d$. Let

$$(33) \quad \epsilon_n \quad := \quad \frac{\min_{\sigma\in S_n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} + dt_n}{d(p-1)}.$$

Note that $1 \leq r_{ij} \leq d-1$ for all $1 \leq i,j \leq d-1$, and $t_n \leq c_n \leq n \leq d-1$ by (22), we have $\epsilon_n \leq \frac{n(2d-1)}{d(p-1)}$. Thus ϵ_n goes to 0 as p approaches ∞. So it suffices to prove

(32). Since $p \geq d^2$ we derive that $H_{ij}^s(\vec{A}), K_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[\vec{A}]$ from their definitions in (13) and (25), respectively. Since $p \geq d^2 - 1$ we always have $1 \leq \lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \rceil + n \leq p-1$. Then

$$u_n := \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\left\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \right\rceil + n)!$$

is a p-adic unit in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. Recall from Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \right\rceil &= \frac{pi + r_{i1} - 1}{d} \equiv \frac{r_{i1}-1}{d} \bmod p \\ \left\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \right\rceil &= \left\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \right\rceil - \delta_{ij} \equiv \frac{r_{i1}-1}{d} - \delta_{ij} \bmod p. \end{aligned}$$

Let $p \geq (d^2+1)(d-1)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) &= \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} \frac{(\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \rceil + n)(\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \rceil + n - 1) \cdots (\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s + 1 - |\vec{m}|)}{\vec{m}!} \vec{A}^{\vec{m}} \\ &\equiv \sum_{\vec{m} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}^s} \frac{(\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \rceil + n)!}{\vec{m}!(\lceil \frac{pi-j}{d} \rceil + s - |\vec{m}|)!} \vec{A}^{\vec{m}} \\ &= (\left\lceil \frac{pi-1}{d} \right\rceil + n)!\ K_{ij}^s(\vec{A}) \bmod p. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $0 \leq t \leq c_n$, by definition of $f_n^t(\vec{A})$ in (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_n^t(\vec{a}) &\equiv u_n \sum_{\substack{s_0 + \cdots + s_n = t \\ s_\ell \geq 0}} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n^{s_0}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{a}) \\ &\equiv u_n \sum_{\substack{s_0 + \cdots + s_n = t \\ s_\ell \geq 0}} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n^{s_0}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{\hat{a}}) \bmod p \qquad (34) \end{aligned}$$

since $K_{ij}^s(\vec{a}) \equiv K_{ij}^s(\vec{\hat{a}}) \bmod p$. Recall that $f_n^t(\vec{A}) = 0$ for all $0 \leq t < t_n$ and $f_n^{t_n}(\vec{A}) \neq 0$. Now suppose $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{V}_n$. By definition $f_n^{t_n}(\vec{a}) \neq 0$. Following Lemma 5.1 there exists $N > 0$ such that for all $p > N$ and $p \equiv r \bmod d$ we have $f_n^{t_n}(\vec{a}) \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. By (34) these above imply

$$\sum_{\substack{s_0 + \cdots + s_n = t \\ s_\ell \geq 0}} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n^{s_0}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} K_{i,\sigma(i)}^{s_i}(\vec{\hat{a}}) \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \equiv 0 \bmod p & \text{for all } 0 \leq t < t_n \\ \not\equiv 0 \bmod p & \text{for } t = t_n. \end{array} \right.$$

Apply Lemma 4.3 it is now clear that $\operatorname{ord}_p C_n(\vec{\hat{a}}) = \frac{M_n + t_n}{p-1}$. Now we conclude (32) by recalling the identity in (23). Thus $\lim_{p \to \infty} \operatorname{ord}_p C_n(\vec{\hat{a}}) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d}$. This finishes our proof. $\square$

Write $\vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1})$. Let $f(x) = x^d + a_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \ldots + a_1 x$ in $(\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})[x]$. Recall from Lemma 2.1 that $L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) = 1 + b_1(\vec{a})T + \cdots + b_{d-1}(\vec{a})T^{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p][T]$.

Corollary 5.3. *Let $1 \leq n \leq d-1$. Let $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{W}_r(\mathbb{Q})$. If $p \equiv r \bmod d$ and p is large enough we have*

$$\operatorname{ord}_p b_n(\vec{a}) = \frac{M_n + t_n}{p-1} = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d} + \frac{\min_{\sigma \in S_n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} r_{i,\sigma(i)} + dt_n}{d(p-1)}.$$

Moreover,

$$\lim_{p\to\infty}\mathrm{ord}_p b_n(\vec{a}) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d}. \tag{35}$$

Proof. Write ϵ_n as in (33). As discussed in Lemma 5.2 it suffices to prove the first statement. Let p be large enough so that statements in Lemma 5.2 hold and for any $1 \leq n \leq d-1$ we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_p C_n(\vec{\hat{a}}) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d} + \epsilon_n.$$

Below we abbreviate C_n for $C_n(\vec{\hat{a}})$ for all n. Write

$$\frac{1}{1+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^n C_n p^n T^n} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{n_1+\cdots+n_k=n\\ n_1,\ldots,n_k\geq 1, k\geq 1}} C_{n_1}\cdots C_{n_k} p^n T^n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} W_n T^n.$$

We claim that $\mathrm{ord}_p W_n = n(\frac{d+1}{d}+\epsilon_1)$. It is trivially true for $n=0$. For $1 \leq n \leq d-1$ we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_p W_n \geq n + \min_{\substack{n_1+\cdots+n_k=n\\ n_1,\ldots,n_k\geq 1, k\geq 1}} \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{k} \frac{n_\ell(n_\ell+1)}{2d} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{k}\epsilon_{n_\ell} \right), \tag{36}$$

where the equality holds if its minimum is unique. But $\sum_{\ell=1}^{k} n_\ell(n_\ell+1) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^{k} 2n_\ell$, so for $n_1+\cdots+n_k = n$, $n_\ell \geq 1$, we have $\sum_{\ell=1}^{k}\frac{n_\ell(n_\ell+1)}{2d} \geq \frac{n}{d}$ where the equality certainly holds if $k=n$, that is, $n_1=\cdots=n_k=1$. Since ϵ_1 converges to 0 as p approaches ∞, when p is big enough we have

$$\frac{n}{d} + n\epsilon_1 < \min_{\substack{n_1+\cdots+n_k=n\\ n_1,\ldots,n_k\geq 1, k<n}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{n_\ell(n_\ell+1)}{2d}.$$

Thus the minimum in (36) is unique at $k=n$ in which case we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_p W_n = n + (\frac{n}{d}+n\epsilon_1) = n(\frac{d+1}{d}+\epsilon_1).$$

By (9),

$$\begin{aligned} L(f\otimes\mathbb{F}_p;T) &= 1 + b_1(\vec{a})T + \cdots + b_{d-1}(\vec{a})T^{d-1} \\ &= \left(\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} p^{n_1}T^{n_1}\right)\left(\sum_{n_2=0}^{\infty}(-1)^{n_2}C_{n_2}T^{n_2}\right)\left(\sum_{n_3=0}^{\infty}W_{n_3}T^{n_3}\right) \\ &= 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{\substack{n_1+n_2+n_3=n\\ n_1,n_2,n_3\geq 0}} (-1)^{n_2}p^{n_1}C_{n_2}W_{n_3}T^n. \end{aligned}$$

So for large enough p one may carry out a simple computation and conclude that

$$\mathrm{ord}_p((-1)^{n_2}p^{n_1}C_{n_2}W_{n_3}) = n_1 + (\frac{n_2(n_2+1)}{2d}+\epsilon_{n_2}) + (\frac{d+1}{d}+\epsilon_1)n_3.$$

For $1 \leq n \leq d-1$, $n_1+n_2+n_3 = n$ and $n_1,n_2,n_3 \geq 0$ the minimal $\mathrm{ord}_p((-1)^{n_2}p^{n_1}C_{n_2}W_{n_3})$ is achieved at $n_1=0, n_2=n, n_3=0$. Thus for $1 \leq n \leq d-1$ we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_p b_n(\vec{a}) = \min_{\substack{n_1+n_2+n_3=n\\ n_1,n_2,n_3\geq 0}} \mathrm{ord}_p((-1)^{n_2}p^{n_1}C_{n_2}W_{n_3}) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2d}+\epsilon_n.$$

This finishes our proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $f(x) = x^d + a_{d-1}x^{d-1} + \ldots + a_1x$ in $(\mathbb{Z}_p \cap \mathbb{Q})[x]$. Write $\vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_{d-1})$. Let r be coprime to d and $1 \leq r \leq d-1$. By Corollary 5.3 we have a Zariski dense open subset $\mathcal{W}_r$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ such that for every $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{W}_r(\mathbb{Q})$ we have

$$\lim_{\substack{p\to\infty \\ p\equiv r \bmod d}} \mathrm{ord}_p b_n(\vec{a}) \quad = \quad \frac{n(n+1)}{2d}.$$

Hence

$$\lim_{\substack{p\to\infty \\ p\equiv r \bmod d}} \mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \quad = \quad \mathrm{HP}(f).$$

Let $\mathcal{W} := \bigcap_{\substack{1\leq r\leq d-1 \\ \gcd(r,d)=1}} \mathcal{W}_r$. It is Zariski dense open in $\mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ by Corollary 3.5, For every f with coefficient vector $\vec{a} \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbb{Q})$ we have

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathrm{HP}(f). \tag{37}$$

Consider the natural projection map $\mu : \mathbb{A}^d \to \mathbb{A}^{d-1}$ by $\mu(f + a_0) = \vec{a}$. The pullback $\mathcal{U} := \mu^{-1}(\mathcal{W})$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ and is Zariski dense open in $\mathbb{A}^d$. Now for any $a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p \bigcap \mathbb{Q}$, by (1), we have $L((f + a_0) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T) = L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; \zeta_p^{a_0} T)$. Thus

$$\mathrm{NP}((f + a_0) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p). \tag{38}$$

By (38) and (37) we have

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{NP}((f + a_0) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathrm{HP}(f) = \mathrm{HP}(f + a_0)$$

for every $f + a_0 \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{Q})$. This finishes the proof of the theorem. □

6. More remarks

Regarding Theorem 1.1 it is not yet established for a fixed $d \geq 3$ how large the complementary set $(\mathbb{A}^d - \mathcal{U})(\mathbb{Q})$ should be and what polynomial $f(x)$ should be in there. In Proposition 6.1 we show that polynomial $f(x) = x^d$ is in $(\mathbb{A}^d - \mathcal{U})(\mathbb{Q})$ for every $d \geq 3$. Since $\mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \frac{\mathrm{NP}(X_f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)}{p-1}$ for the Artin-Schreier curve $X_f : y^p - y = f(x)$ (see discussion in section 1), the eigenvalues of $L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T)$ are Gauss sums as worked out in [8, chapter III]. The prime factorization of the Gauss sums are given by Stickelberger theorem (see [19, Chapter 6]). This yields the p-adic Newton polygon of $L(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p; T)$ and hence $\mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$. Let us describe the resulted Newton polygon: Let σ be a permutation in the degree $d-1$ symmetric group S_{d-1} such that for every $1 \leq n \leq d-1$ we let $\sigma(n)$ be the least positive residue of $pn \bmod d$. Write σ as a product of disjoint cycles (including 1-cycles). Let σ_i be a ℓ_i-cycle in σ. Let $\lambda_i := \sum n/(d\ell_i)$ where the sum ranges over all n in the standard representation of the ℓ_i-cycle σ_i. Arrange σ_i in such an order that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots$. For every σ_i in σ let the pair (λ_i, ℓ_i) of rational numbers represent the line segment of (horizontal) length ℓ_i and of slope λ_i. The *joint of line segments* (λ_i, ℓ_i) is the lower convex hull consisting of line segment (λ_i, ℓ_i)'s connected at their endpoints. It uniquely determines a Newton polygon. One may show that $\mathrm{NP}(x^d \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$ is the joint of (λ_i, ℓ_i)'s. Note that $\mathrm{NP}(x^d \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$ only depends on the residue class of $p \bmod d$. I thank Kiran Kedlaya for discussions which simplified my initial formulation.

Proposition 6.1. *The limit of* $\mathrm{NP}(x^d \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$ *does not exist as* p *approaches* ∞.

Proof. Let notation be as above. We claim that there exists σ_i in σ with $\ell_i > 1$. Support σ is a product of 1-cycles then σ is identity and so $pn \equiv n \bmod d$ for every $1 \leq n \leq d-1$. Choose n to be coprime to d then we get $p \equiv 1 \bmod d$. This implies that for $p \not\equiv 1 \bmod d$ there exists at least one $\ell_i > 1$. But for $p \equiv 1 \bmod d$ we have $\ell_i = 1$ for all i. Thus $\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p)$ does not exist. □

Remark 6.2. For any $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ and $c_3, c_4 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ one observes that $X_f : y^p - y = x^d$ is isomorphic over $\mathbb{F}_p$ to $X'_f : y^p - y = c_1(c_2x + c_3)^d + c_4$. Thus

$$\mathrm{NP}((c_1(c_2x + c_3)^d + c_4) \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \mathrm{NP}(x^d \otimes \mathbb{F}_p).$$

Remark 6.3. Permutations polynomials are potential elements in $(\mathbb{A}^d - \mathcal{U})(\mathbb{Q})$. (See [11, Chapter 7].) Suppose that $f(x) \in \mathbb{A}^d(\mathbb{Q})$ is a permutation polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_p$ for all $p \equiv r \bmod d$ for some r, then $S_1(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_p} \zeta_p^{f(x)} = \sum_{x\in\mathbb{F}_p} \zeta_p^x = 0$. Then by (8) we have $b_1 = S_1(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$ for all $p \equiv r \bmod d$. Consequently $\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{ord}_p b_\ell \neq \frac{\ell(\ell+1)}{2d}$. Therefore, $\lim_{p\to\infty} \mathrm{NP}(f \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \neq \mathrm{HP}(f)$.

Remark 6.4. Let $f_d(x)$ be a d-th Dickson polynomial (see more general definition in [11, Section 7.2] and in particular (7.6) here), then it is well-known that $f_d(x)$ is a permutations polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$ (i.e., this polynomial function defines an onto map from $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$ to $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$) if and only if $\gcd(d, p^{2\ell} - 1) = 1$ (see proof in [11, Theorem 7.16]). Then it is an exercise to show that for every odd $d > 3$, we have $b_1 = S_1(f_d \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) = 0$ for all $p \equiv 2 \bmod d$. Thus the Newton polygon does not converge to the Hodge one as p goes to infinity.

References

[1] Allen Adolphson; Steven Sperber: Newton polyhedra and the degree of the L-function associated to an exponential sum. *Invent. Math.* **88** (1987), 555–569.

[2] Allen Adolphson; Steven Sperber: Exponential sums and Newton polyhedra: Cohomology and estimates, *Annals of Mathematics* **130** (1989), 367–406.

[3] Enrico Bombieri: On exponential sums in finite fields, *American J. Math.* **88** (1966), 71–105.

[4] Bernard Dwork: On the zeta function of a hypersurface. II. *Ann. of Math.* **80** (1964), 227–299.

[5] Bernard Dwork: On the zeta function of a hypersurface. *Publication Math. IHES,* (1962), 5–68.

[6] Shao-Fang Hong: Newton polygons of L functions associated with exponential sums of polynomials of degree four over finite fields. *Finite Fields Appl.* **7** (2001), 205–237.

[7] Nicholas M. Katz: Sommes exponentielles, *Astérisque* **79**, Société mathématique de France. 1980.

[8] Neal Koblitz: p-adic analysis: a short course on recent work, *London mathematical society lecture note series* **46**. Cambridge university press, 1980.

[9] Neal Koblitz: p-adic numbers, p-adic analysis, and Zeta-functions, (Second edition), *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* **58**. Springer-Verlag, 1984.

[10] Serge Lang: *Algebra* Third edition. Addison-Wesley, 1993.

[11] Rudolf Lidl; Harald Niederreiter: *Finite fields. Second edition*, Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications **20**, Edited by G.-C. Rota. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[12] Jasper Scholten; Hui June Zhu: Slope estimates of Artin-Schreier curves, electronic preprint available online at `http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/math.AG/0105005`.

[13] Jasper Scholten; Hui June Zhu: The first slope case of Wan's conjecture. Preprint available at `http://www.math.berkeley.edu/zhu/preprints.html/`.

[14] Steven Sperber: Congruence properties of the hyperkloosterman sum, *Compositio Math.,* **40** (1980), 3–33.

[15] Steven Sperber: Newton polygons for general hyperkloosterman sums, in *p-adic cohomology*, *Astérisque*, **119–120** (1984), 267–330.

[16] Steven Sperber: On the p-adic theory of exponential sums, *American J. Math.,* **109** (1986), 255–296.

[17] Daqing Wan: An introduction to the theory of Newton polygons for L-functions of exponential sums, To appear. Preprint available at `http://www.math.uci.edu/dwan/Overview.html`.

[18] Daqing Wan: *In preparation.*

[19] Lawrence Washington: Introduction to cyclotomic fields. *Second edition.* Graduate texts in mathematics **83**. Springer, 1997.

[20] Hui June Zhu: p-adic variation of L functions of exponential sums, II. (In preparation).

Hui June Zhu, Department of mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840. The United States.

E-mail address: `zhu@alum.calberkeley.org`